

EXHIBIT I

EXHIBIT I

**APPENDIX OF AUTHORITY IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANTS' ARGUMENT THAT
IPPS' CLAIMS ARE BARRED IN WHOLE OR IN PART BY STATE STATUTES OF
LIMITATIONS**

	State	Authority	Cut-Off Date	WH Treatment
1.	Arizona	Ariz. Rev. Stat. § 44-1410 (four year statute of limitations); <i>Tovrea Land & Cattle Co. v. Linsenmeyer</i> , 412 P.2d 47, 63 (Ariz. 1966) (plaintiff must plead affirmative acts with particularity to toll statute of limitations).	June 8, 2008	Argument not raised previously.
2.	Arkansas	Ark. Code § 4-88-115 (five year statute of limitations); <i>Bomar v. Moser</i> , 251 S.W.3d 234, 241-42 (Ark. 2007) (plaintiff must plead affirmative acts and due diligence with particularity to toll statute of limitations).	June 8, 2007	Argument not raised previously.
3.	California	Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 16750.1 (four year antitrust statute of limitations); <i>id.</i> § 17208 (four year consumer protection statute of limitations); <i>Sanchez v. South Hoover Hospital</i> , 553 P.2d 1129, 1134 (Cal. 1976) (plaintiff must due diligence with particularity to toll statute of limitations).; <i>Hesse v. Vinatieri</i> , 302 P.2d 699, 702 (Cal. Dist. Ct. App. 1956) (citations omitted) (plaintiff must plead affirmative acts with particularity to toll statute of limitations).	June 8, 2008	Argument not raised previously.
4.	D.C.	D.C. Code § 28-4511 (four year antitrust statute of limitations); <i>id.</i> § 12-301(8) (three year consumer protection statute of limitations); <i>Cevenini v. Archbishop of Wash.</i> , 707 A.2d 768, 773-74 (D.C. Ct. App. 1998) (plaintiff must plead affirmative acts and due diligence with particularity to toll statute of limitations).	June 8, 2008 (antitrust); June 8, 2009 (consumer protection; unjust enrichment)	Argument not raised previously.

EXHIBIT I

	State	Authority	Cut-Off Date	WH Treatment
5.	Florida	Fla. Stat. Ann. § 95.11(3) (four year statute of limitations); <i>First Fed. Savings & Loan Ass'n of Wisconsin v. Dade Fed. Savings & Loan Ass'n</i> , 403 So.2d 1097, 1100 (Fla. Dist. Ct. App. 1981) (plaintiff must plead affirmative acts and due diligence with particularity to toll statute of limitations).	June 8, 2008	Argument not raised previously.
6.	Hawaii	Haw. Rev. Stat. § 480-24 (four year statute of limitations); <i>Au v. Au</i> , 626 P.2d 173, 178 (Haw. 1981) (plaintiff must plead affirmative acts with particularity to toll statute of limitations).	June 8, 2008	Argument not raised previously.
7.	Illinois	740 ILCS 10/7(2) (four year statute of limitations); <i>People v. Coleman</i> , 794 N.E. 2d 275, 293 (Ill. 2002) (plaintiff must plead affirmative acts and due diligence with particularity to toll statute of limitations).	June 8, 2008	Argument not raised previously.
8.	Iowa	Iowa Code Ann. § 553.16(1) (four year statute of limitations); <i>Christy v. Miulli</i> , 692 N.W.2d 694, 702 (Iowa 2005) (plaintiff must plead affirmative acts and due diligence with particularity to toll statute of limitations).	June 8, 2008	Argument not raised previously.
9.	Kansas	Kan. Stat. Ann. § 60-512(2) (three year statute of limitations); <i>Friends Univ. v. W.R. Grace & Co.</i> , 608 P.2d 936, 941 (Kan. 1980) (plaintiff must plead affirmative acts and due diligence with particularity to toll statute of limitations).	June 8, 2009	Argument not raised previously.
10.	Maine	14 Me. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 752 (six year statute of limitations); <i>Harkness v. Fitzgerald</i> , 701 A.2d 370, 372 (Me. 1997) (plaintiff must plead affirmative acts with particularity to toll statute of limitations).	June 8, 2006	Argument not raised previously.

EXHIBIT I

	State	Authority	Cut-Off Date	WH Treatment
11.	Massachusetts	Mass. Gen. Laws Ann. Ch. 93 § 13 (four year statute of limitations); <i>Puritan Med. Ctr., Inc. v. Cashman</i> , 596 N.E.2d 1004, 1010 (Mass. 1992) (plaintiff must plead affirmative acts and due diligence with particularity to toll statute of limitations); <i>Frank Cooke, Inc. v. Hurwitz</i> , 406 N.E.2d 678, 684 (Mass. App. Ct. 1980) (same).	June 8, 2008	Argument not raised previously.
12.	Michigan	Mich. Comp. Laws Ann. § 445.781 (four year statute of limitations); <i>McNaughton v. Rockford State Bank</i> , 246 N.W. 84, 86 (Mich. 1933) (plaintiff must plead affirmative acts and due diligence with particularity to toll statute of limitations); <i>Sills v. Oakland Gen. Hosp.</i> , 559 N.W.2d 348, 352 (Mich. Ct. App. 1997) (same).	June 8, 2008	Argument not raised previously.
13.	Minnesota	Minn. Stat. Ann. § 325D.64 (four year statute of limitations); <i>State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co. v. Ford Motor Co.</i> , 572 N.W.2d 321, 325 (Minn. Ct. App. 1997) (plaintiff must plead affirmative acts and due diligence with particularity to toll statute of limitations).	June 8, 2008	Argument not raised previously.
14.	Mississippi	Miss. Code Ann. § 15-1-49 (three year statute of limitations); <i>Spann v. Diaz</i> , 987 So. 2d 443, 449 (Miss. 2008) (plaintiff must plead affirmative acts and due diligence with particularity to toll statute of limitations); <i>Stephens v. Equitable Life Assurance Soc’y of U.S.</i> , 850 So. 2d 78, 84 (Miss. 2003) (same).	June 8, 2009	Argument not raised previously.
15.	Missouri	Mo. Rev. Stat. § 516.120 (five year statute of limitations); <i>Batek v. Curators of Univ. of Mo.</i> , 920 SW 2d 895, 900 (Mo. 1996) (en banc) (plaintiff must plead affirmative acts and due diligence with particularity to toll statute of limitations).	June 8, 2007	Argument not raised previously.
16.	Montana	Mont. Code § 27-2-11 (two year statute of limitations); <i>id.</i> § 27-2-102(3); <i>Rucinsky v. Hentchel</i> , 881 P.2d 616, 618 (Mont. 1994) (plaintiff must plead affirmative acts and due diligence with particularity to toll statute of limitations).	June 8, 2010	Argument not raised previously.

EXHIBIT I

	State	Authority	Cut-Off Date	WH Treatment
17.	Nebraska	Neb. Rev. Stat. § 59-1612 (four year statute of limitations); <i>Upah v. Ancona Bros. Co.</i> , 521 N.W.2d 895, 902 (Neb. 1994) (plaintiff must plead affirmative acts and due diligence with particularity to toll statute of limitations).	June 8, 2008	Argument not raised previously.
18.	Nevada	Nev. Rev. Stat. § 598A.220 (four year statute of limitations); <i>Pooler v. R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Co.</i> , No. CV00-02674, 2001 WL 403167, at *2 (Nev. Dist. Ct. Apr. 4, 2001) (plaintiff must plead affirmative acts and due diligence with particularity to toll statute of limitations).	June 8, 2008	Argument not raised previously.
19.	New Hampshire	N.H. Rev. Stat. § 356:12 (four year statute of limitations); <i>Portsmouth Country Club v. Town of Greenland</i> , 883 A.2d 298, 304-05 (N.H. 2005) (plaintiff must plead affirmative acts and due diligence with particularity to toll statute of limitations).	June 8, 2008	Argument not raised previously.
20.	New Mexico	N.M. Stat. Ann. § 57-1-12 (four year statute of limitations); <i>Cont'l Potash, Inc. v. Freeport-McMoran, Inc.</i> , 858 P.2d 66, 74 (N.M. 1993) (plaintiff must plead affirmative acts and due diligence with particularity to toll statute of limitations).	June 8, 2008	Argument not raised previously.
21.	New York	N.Y. Gen. Bus. Law § 340(5) (four year antitrust statute of limitations); N.Y. C.P.L.R. § 214(2) (three year consumer protection statute of limitations); <i>Pahlad ex rel. Berger v. Brustman</i> , 823 N.Y.S.2d 61, 64 (N.Y. App. Div. 2006), <i>aff'd</i> 865 N.E.2d 1240 (N.Y. 2007) (plaintiff must plead affirmative acts and due diligence with particularity to toll statute of limitations).	June 8, 2008 (antitrust); June 8, 2009 (consumer protection; unjust enrichment)	Argument not raised previously.

EXHIBIT I

	State	Authority	Cut-Off Date	WH Treatment
22.	North Carolina	N.C. Gen. Stat § 75-16.2 (four year statute of limitations); <i>Pembee Mfg. Corp. v. Cape Fear Constr. Co.</i> , 317 S.E.2d 41, 44 (N.C. Ct. App. 1984) (plaintiff must plead affirmative acts with particularity to toll statute of limitations); <i>Crawford v. Paul Davis Restoration Triad Inc.</i> , No. COA02-1040, 2003 WL 21436156, at *4 (N.C. App. June 17, 2003) (plaintiff must plead affirmative acts with particularity to toll statute of limitations).	June 8, 2008	Argument not raised previously.
23.	North Dakota	N.D. Cent. Code § 51-08.1-10(1) (four year statute of limitations); <i>id.</i> § 28-01-24; <i>Roether v. Nat'l Union Fire Ins. Co.</i> , 200 N.W. 818, 822 (N.D. 1924) (plaintiff must plead affirmative acts and due diligence with particularity to toll statute of limitations).	June 8, 2008	Argument not raised previously.
24.	Oregon	Or. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 646.140 (four year statute of limitations); <i>Chaney v. Fields Chevrolet Co.</i> , 503 P.2d 1239, 1241-42 (Or. 1972) (plaintiff must plead affirmative acts and due diligence with particularity to toll statute of limitations).	June 8, 2008	Argument not raised previously.
25.	Rhode Island	R.I. Gen. Laws § 6-36-23 (four year statute of limitations); <i>Ryan v. Roman Catholic Bishop of Providence</i> , 941 A.2d 174, 182 (R.I. 2008) (plaintiff must plead affirmative acts with particularity to toll statute of limitations); <i>Martin v. Howard</i> , 784 A.2d 291, 299-300 (R.I. 2001) (plaintiff must plead due diligence with particularity to toll statute of limitations).	June 8, 2008	Argument not raised previously.
26.	South Carolina	S.C. Stat. Ann. § 39-5-150 (three year statute of limitations); <i>Barr v. City of Rock Hill</i> , 500 S.E.2d 157, 159-60 (S.C. 1998) (plaintiff must plead “reasonable diligence” with particularity to toll statute of limitations)	June 8, 2009	Argument not raised previously.

EXHIBIT I

	State	Authority	Cut-Off Date	WH Treatment
27.	South Dakota	S.D. Codified Laws § 37-1-14.4 (four year statute of limitations); <i>Spencer v. Estate of Spencer</i> , 759 N.W.2d 539, 544 (S.D. 2008) (plaintiff must plead affirmative acts and due diligence with particularity to toll statute of limitations); <i>Strassburg v. Citizens State Bank</i> , 581 N.W.2d 510, 515 (S.D. 1998) (same).	June 8, 2008	Argument not raised previously.
28.	Tennessee	Tenn. Code Ann. § 28-3-105 (three year statute of limitations); <i>Shadrick v. Coker</i> , 963 S.W.2d 726, 733-34 (Tenn. 1998) (plaintiff must plead affirmative acts and due diligence with particularity to toll statute of limitations).	June 8, 2009	Argument not raised previously.
29.	Utah	Utah Code Ann. § 76-10-925 (four year statute of limitations); <i>Colosimo v. Roman Catholic Bishop</i> , 156 P.3d 806, 816-17 (Utah 2007) (plaintiff must plead affirmative acts and due diligence with particularity to toll statute of limitations).	June 8, 2008	Argument not raised previously.
30.	Vermont	12 Vt. Stat. Ann. § 511 (six year statute of limitations); <i>Rodrigue v. Valco Enter.</i> , 726 A.2d 61, 64 (Vt. 1999) (plaintiff must plead affirmative acts and due diligence with particularity to toll statute of limitations).	June 8, 2006	Argument not raised previously.
31.	West Virginia	W. Va. Code Ann. § 47-18-11 (four year statute of limitations); <i>Sattler v. Bailey</i> , 400 S.E.2d 220, 228 (W.V. 1990) (plaintiff must plead affirmative acts and due diligence with particularity to toll statute of limitations).	June 8, 2008	Argument not raised previously.
32.	Wisconsin	Wisc. Stat. Ann. § 133.18(2) (six year statute of limitations); <i>State ex rel. Susedik v. Knutson</i> , 191 N.W.2d 23, 25-26 (Wis. 1971) (plaintiff must plead affirmative acts and reasonable diligence with particularity to toll statute of limitations).	June 8, 2006	Argument not raised previously.